Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	١

HARVEY BLIGHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-03031-KAW

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S 'ION FOR INTRA-DISTRICT FER TO THE SAN FRANCISCO VISION; ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE A CONSENT/ **DECLINATION FORM**

Re: Dkt. No. 13

On June 30, 2015, Plaintiff Harvey Blight filed a civil rights lawsuit against the State of California, San Mateo County, and others. (Dkt. No. 1.)

On July 30, 2015, Plaintiff filed a petition for intra-district transfer to the San Francisco Division on the grounds that he has a heart condition and the San Francisco Courthouse is more convenient because "he can get to hearings simply by using available trains or buses." (Dkt. No. 13 at 1.) Under Civil L.R. 3-2(c), "[p]ursuant to the Court's Assignment Plan,...all civil actions and proceedings for which this district is the proper venue shall be assigned by the Clerk to a Courthouse serving the county in which the action arises." Civil L.R. 3-2(d), however, provides that "all civil actions which arise in the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo or Sonoma shall be assigned to the San Francisco Division or the Oakland Division." For that reason, the matter was properly assigned to the Oakland Division under Civil L.R. 3-2(h).

In practice, civil cases are generally not transferred between the San Francisco and Oakland Divisions for a variety of reasons, one of which is their close proximity. The Oakland Courthouse is served by public transit, including BART, so any perceived hardship by Mr. Blight for having to spend a little more time en route to court is not sufficient to implicate the

Case 3:15-cv-03031-EMC Document 15 Filed 08/03/15 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court Northern District of California

convenience or interests of justice concerns	articulated in Civil L.R. 3-2(h).	Therefore, Plaintiff's
petition is DENIED.		

Additionally, the Court notes that Plaintiff has not consented to the jurisdiction of the undersigned to preside over his case. Plaintiff shall complete the attached consent/declination form and file it with the Court by no later than August 17, 2015.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 3, 2015

KANDIS A. WESTMORE United States Magistrate Judge